

Government Orders

I want to see at least 80 per cent of those moneys collected actually going into the research and the promotion of the product which was ostensibly the reason for having obtained the right from Parliament to make that kind of collection.

Motion No. 8, while it is fairly lengthy, basically I think we should be stating in this act what the ground rules are with regard to bringing to an end one of these agencies. The act is quite silent on that. I think it is possible under the current wording of the act for the minister and the marketing council to call for an end to an agency, but is not really clear.

What this proposal would do would be to add a 42.1(1) which would make it possible for 5 per cent of the producers engaged in the production or marketing of the product being able to petition the marketing council and the Governor in Council, in other words the cabinet, to bring to an end the particular check-off that was established by the Governor in Council or under this act.

Because there are fewer persons engaged in the importation of the product that might be subject to this levy, I thought that it would be only fair if at least 50 per cent of those persons would be required to petition an end to the provision of payment of levies on their part. Essentially, Motion No. 8 simply points out that it would be possible for a democratic process to occur to bring to an end to one of the agencies that had been established for the collection of these levies. In effect, 5 per cent of the farm producers would sign a petition asking that the agency come to an end and/or 50 per cent of those persons engaged in the importation of the product. That is basically what Motion No. 8 does.

• (1600)

Motion No. 9 would put as a requirement the reporting by the agency as to what it did with the money and make it accountable to the producers from whom it collected the money on an annual basis. A copy of an annual audited statement or audited report of the agency and a copy of what the agency did with the money would have to be made available to each of the contributors to the program, which it seems to me is common practice. However, that is not outlined clearly in the bill. I believe the intention of the government is simply to have an annual report gravitate somehow to the Farm Products

Marketing Council and it can do with it as it pleases. I think it should be made more public than that.

Motion No. 9 would have that report made public to all the contributors to the fund the agency is managing to promote products and promote more research.

I think these are quite common sense, logical kinds of amendments and I would call on all members of the House to give them their full support.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 2 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 6 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 7 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.